

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II**

for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2003-2004**



**PART I DUE JANUARY 31, 2005**  
**PART II DUE APRIL 15, 2005**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce “red tape” and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by January 31, 2005. Part II is due to the Department by April 15, 2005.

## **PART I**

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **January 31, 2005**, requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of NCLB. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

## **PART II**

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2003-2004 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2003-2004 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report. Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **January 31, 2005**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2003-2004 school year, unless otherwise noted. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities).

States may use this format or a format of their choosing to submit the required information. If the information is available through another source, States may refer the Department to that source, e.g., State Report Cards. If a State refers the Department to another source, it must provide specific information on where the data may be accessed, e.g. the URL for the State Report Card.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to [conreport@ed.gov](mailto:conreport@ed.gov), or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield  
U.S. Department of Education  
Room 3E307  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 182 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E231, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: 1810-0614  
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

South Dakota Department of Education

Address:

700 Governors Drive  
Pierre, SD 57501

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Melody Schopp

Telephone: 605-773-5232

Fax: 605-773-6139

e-mail: melody.schopp@state.sd.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2003-2004**



**PART I DUE JANUARY 31, 2005**

## **I. STANDARDS and ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

<b>A. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).</b>
---

<b>STATE RESPONSE</b>
-----------------------

### **Grade Level Content Standards**

South Dakota contracted a committee of approximately 50 K-16 educators to revise the State Science Standards. The committee, under the facilitation of a professional curriculum specialist, met throughout the summer and school year to create the Science Standards. This revision is in response to the revision cycle that South Dakota has scheduled for all core subject areas.

The Standards were compared to the National Assessment of Educational Progress standards and had a positive correlation. The Standards were presented to the State Board of Education for open comment on 26 January, 2005, and Board approval for these Standards is anticipated in Spring, 2005.

### **Extended Standards**

In April 2004 groups of South Dakota teachers developed extended standards for Reading and Math. At the same time teachers developed performance levels. The extended standards provide a downward extension of South Dakota's Core Content Standards. The extended standards serve as the content domains for the alternate assessment. Two workgroups were comprised of general and special education teachers, one group for Math and one for Reading. The teachers were carefully selected to represent all grade levels primary-high school. Careful consideration was given to have broad representation of teachers from across the state.

In June, Buros Center for Testing conducted an alignment study to assess the degree of match between the core content standards and the extended standards to which they

were intended to align. Buros worked with South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE) and South Dakota teachers from grades K-12 in Reading and Math. Teachers were selected from both special and general education.

In early July SDDOE received a preliminary report from Buros on the alignment of the extended standards. The report showed the percent of agreement between the content standards and the extended standards. Following the report SD teachers were convened for two days to make minor adjustments to the extended standards in response to the alignment study.

On July 26, 2004 the extended standards were presented to the State Board of Education for a first reading. The extended standards were on the Special Education website for 30 days for public comment. Following the closing of the comment period, limited changes were made based on comments. Buros presented SDDOE with a final alignment report on August 31 2004. The extended standards were presented to the South Dakota Board of Education on September 20, 2004 and received board approval.

In February 2005, SDDOE and South Dakota teachers will organize the existing extended standards, linking them to grade level expectations.

**B. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.**

#### **STATE RESPONSE**

#### **DAKOTA STEP**

Dakota STEP (State Test of Educational Progress) is the assessment system for accountability in South Dakota schools. STEP has as its basic platform the SAT 10 Abbreviated test. The SAT 10 Abbreviated test has been augmented to fully assess South Dakota Content Standards in Reading and Mathematics as required by *No Child Left Behind*. Science augmentation will be added before 2007 per *NCLB* timelines. Science content standards are being revised at this time

Dakota STEP is given at Grades 3-8 and 11. The augmented SAT 10 is untimed and will yield both norm-referenced and standards-based scores. Subjects that will be assessed by the abbreviated form of the SAT 10 (norm-referenced) will include Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies and Language Arts. Standards that will be



assessed by the add-on augmentation are the SD Content Standards in Reading and Mathematics for each grade (2003) plus eventually the SD Content Standards in Science for each grade (by 2007).

This year (2005) will be the third year South Dakota has administered the STEP test in Grades 3-8 and 11. SD teachers have been involved since the beginning in the development of the test, including alignment studies for Reading and Math. Third party alignment studies were completed by SD teachers with a third party, Buros.

### **ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT**

SDDOE contracted with Harcourt to revise the alternate assessment tool. Harcourt provided SDDOE with the Statewide Team Led Alternate Assessment and Reporting System (STAARS) at the end of October.

SDDOE and Harcourt provided regional statewide trainings on the newly revised assessment tool for special educators November 1 -4 2004.

The initial rating scales and data collection documents were completed and shipped to Harcourt by December 15, 2004. The documents were scored at Harcourt. The second document submission for the STAARS is April 15, 2005. The documents will be scored and results of the assessment will be used for Adequate Yearly Progress for the 2004-2005 testing year, based upon alternate achievement standards.

**C. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.**

### **STATE RESPONSE**

#### **Grade Level Achievement Standards**

The performance descriptors are organized into proficiency levels. These proficiency levels describe how a student at that level would be expected to perform the grade level standards. To identify increasing proficiency in reading, the levels are labeled as follows:

- **Advanced:** A student performing at the advanced level exceeds expectations for that grade level. The student is able to perform the content standards for the grade at a high level of difficulty, complexity, or fluency.

- **Proficient:** A student performing at the proficient level meets expectations for that grade level. The student is able to perform the content standards for the grade at the level of difficulty, complexity, or fluency specified by the standards.
- **Basic:** A student performing at the basic level performs below expectations for that grade level. The student is able to perform some of the content standards for the grade below the level of difficulty, complexity, or fluency specified by the grade level standards.

A student performing below the basic level is unable to perform the content standards for the grade. Therefore, no description is provided for this performance level.

Content specific grade level performance descriptors have been developed for grades K – 12 in both reading and mathematics. Science descriptors are being developed in conjunction with the revision of the science content standards.

## DAKOTA STEP

### Raw and Scaled Score Cut Points and Performance Standards

#### June 2004

#### Grade 3 – State Performance Standards

Subtest	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading Scale Score	498 or Below	499 – 604	605 – 661	662 or Above
Reading Raw Score	0 – 5	6 – 34	35 – 52	53 – 63
Math Scale Score	502 or Below	503 – 589	590 – 643	644 or Above
Math Raw Score	0 – 13	14 – 59	60 – 88	89 – 105

#### Grade 4 – State Performance Standards

Subtest	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading Scale Score	495 or Below	496 – 594	595 – 647	648 or Above
Reading Raw Score	0 – 3	4 – 19	20 – 31	32 – 42
Math Scale Score	512 or Below	513 – 611	612 – 663	664 or Above
Math Raw Score	0 – 7	8 – 49	50 – 79	80 – 105

#### Grade 5 – State Performance Standards

Subtest	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading Scale Score	543 or Below	544 – 629	630 – 675	676 or Above
Reading Raw Score	0 – 5	6 – 23	24 – 33	34 – 42
Math Scale Score	551 or Below	552 – 634	635 – 681	682 or Above
Math Raw Score	0 – 10	11 – 50	51 – 78	79 – 105

**Grade 6 – State Performance Standards**

<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Below Basic</b>	<b>Basic</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
Reading Scale Score	565 or Below	566 – 638	639 – 690	691 or Above
Reading Raw Score	0 – 10	11 – 34	35 – 51	52 – 64
Math Scale Score	575 or Below	576 – 657	658 – 704	705 or Above
Math Raw Score	0 – 15	16 – 60	61 – 85	86 – 105

**Grade 7 – State Performance Standards**

<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Below Basic</b>	<b>Basic</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
Reading Scale Score	581 or Below	582 – 659	660 – 708	709 or Above
Reading Raw Score	0 – 10	11 – 33	34 – 46	47 – 55
Math Scale Score	588 or Below	589 – 673	674 – 732	733 or Above
Math Raw Score	0 – 10	11 – 51	52 – 85	86 – 105

**Grade 8 – State Performance Standards**

<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Below Basic</b>	<b>Basic</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
Reading Scale Score	535 or Below	536 – 663	664 – 718	719 or Above
Reading Raw Score	0 – 2	3 – 27	28 – 41	42 – 49
Math Scale Score	586 or Below	587 – 685	686 – 734	735 or Above
Math Raw Score	0 – 7	8 – 51	52 – 80	81 – 105

**Grade 11 – State Performance Standards**

<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Below Basic</b>	<b>Basic</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
Reading Scale Score	610 or Below	611 – 715	716 – 762	763 or Above
Reading Raw Score	0 – 5	6 – 26	27 – 35	36 – 42
Math Scale Score	577 or Below	578 – 702	703 – 758	759 or Above
Math Raw Score	0 – 3	4 – 46	47 – 80	81 – 105

**Alternate Achievement Standards**

Performance levels were defined for the Alternate Achievement Standards at the same time as the extended standards were developed in April of 2004. The alternate levels and their corresponding grade-level performance levels are as follows:

- Advancing= Advanced
- Applying= Proficient
- Developing= Basic
- Introducing=Below Basic

Corresponding alternate Performance Descriptors for each grade level, K – 12, will be developed in conjunction with the revision and reorganization of the extended standards into grade level expectations with completion expected by summer 2005.

Cut Scores for proficiency levels will be established in the summer of 2005. The Buros Institute, University of Lincoln, Nebraska, will conduct a standards setting process with the Department of Education.

## **II. PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

### **A. Participation of All Students in 2003-2004 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2003-2004 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

**Student Participation in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration**

<b>2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	65,893	99.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,334	98.5%
Asian	658	96.8%
Black or African American	971	98.3%
Hispanic or Latino	1,156	98.2%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA
White	55,764	99.5%
Students with Disabilities	8,222	99.4%
Limited English Proficient	2,124	98.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	23,690	99.2%
Migrant	334	99.1%
Male	33,818	99.4%
Female	32,075	99.3%

<b>2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	65,825	99.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,326	98.2%
Asian	658	96.8%
Black or African American	973	98.5%
Hispanic or Latino	1,146	97.4%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA
White	55,722	99.5%
Students with Disabilities	8,205	99.2%
Limited English Proficient	2,119	98.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	23,663	99.1%
Migrant	333	98.8%
Male	33,771	99.2%
Female	32,054	99.3%

## B. Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

### Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration

<b>2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	<b>7683</b>	<b>99.4%</b>
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	<b>539</b>	<b>Data is not collected%</b>

<b>2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	<b>7666</b>	<b>99.2%</b>
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	<b>539</b>	<b>Data is not collected %</b>

### **III. STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2003-2004 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2003-2004 school year. States should provide data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2003-2004 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Student Group	Grade 3 Reading Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 3 Math Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 4 Reading Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 4 Math Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
All Students	77.8%	73.5%	87.2%	77.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	53.3%	46.1%	69.4%	50.5%
Asian	72.2%	68.1%	87.7%	74.8%
Black or African American	66.2%	54.5%	73.3%	55.8%
Hispanic or Latino	56.8%	45.4%	76.8%	61.8%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	NA
White	82.3%	78.8%	90.4%	82.9%
Students with Disabilities	47.6%	48.9%	60.4%	48.1%
Limited English Proficient	29.5%	33.2%	53.6%	37.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	65.7%	60.4%	78.6%	64.9%
Migrant	52.7%	44.8%	71.2%	67.7%
Male	75.1%	74.3%	85.0%	77.9%
Female	80.7%	72.7%	89.7%	77.8%

Student Group	Grade 5 Reading Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 5 Math Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 6 Reading Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 6 Math Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
All Students	76.9%	74.0%	77.3%	64.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	51.3%	44.4%	50.2%	29.7%
Asian	78.8%	77.5%	85.9%	78.3%
Black or African American	61.3%	46.7%	60.9%	47.2%
Hispanic or Latino	62.4%	50.9%	59.5%	39.9%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	NA
White	81.5%	79.6%	82.0%	70.6%
Students with Disabilities	35.9%	38.2%	32.0%	23.3%
Limited English Proficient	36.0%	30.7%	29.9%	19.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	64.8%	60.2%	66.0%	48.9%
Migrant	53.5%	52.3%	58.5%	40.4%
Male	73.9%	74.3%	74.2%	64.6%
Female	80.2%	73.6%	80.6%	64.4%



Student Group	Grade 7 Reading Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 7 Math Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 8 Reading Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 8 Math Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
All Students	72.0%	65.6%	78.3%	66.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	42.1%	30.9%	53.4%	30.0%
Asian	68.4%	70.7%	76.6%	69.2%
Black or African American	60.0%	46.2%	60.8%	35.0%
Hispanic or Latino	50.3%	43.8%	66.9%	43.9%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	NA
White	76.9%	71.3%	82.1%	71.7%
Students with Disabilities	21.2%	17.2%	29.0%	16.2%
Limited English Proficient	22.6%	21.2%	25.9%	19.0%
Economically Disadvantaged	56.9%	49.1%	65.7%	49.4%
Migrant	39.1%	34.8%	63.6%	38.2%
Male	69.0%	64.2%	73.8%	65.0%
Female	75.2%	67.0%	83.1%	67.4%

Student Group	Grade 11 Reading Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	Grade 11 Math Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	State Reading Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced	State Math Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
All Students	72.7%	72.7%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	46.4%	34.7%		
Asian	62.6%	70.7%		
Black or African American	37.1%	43.8%		
Hispanic or Latino	46.5%	50.5%		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA		
White	75.4%	75.9%		
Students with Disabilities	16.4%	16.8%		
Limited English Proficient	27.4%	16.0%		
Economically Disadvantaged	59.3%	56.7%		
Migrant	32.3%	41.9%		
Male	67.8%	71.4%		
Female	77.7%	74.0%		

**IV. SCHOOL and DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

**A.** For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>School Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	<b>721</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>78%</b>

<b>District Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	<b>170</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>97%</b>

**B.** For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>Title I School Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of Title I schools in State</b>	<b>Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	<b>350</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>77%</b>

<b>Title I District Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of Title I districts in State</b>	<b>Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	<b>165</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>97%</b>

### **C. Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2004-2005 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year, please mark "Made AYP 2003-2004."

2. Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

A School Improvement Conference was provided in August for all schools in school improvement. Requirements of this identification were discussed and technical assistance that would be provided by the SEA was outlined. Breakout sessions were provided on varying topics from school choice to reading and math strategies for middle school students. The sessions offered provided information for both Title I and non-Title I schools and for each grade span from elementary to high school.

The state provide technical assistance through seven regional ESAs (Educational Service Agencies) and the School Support Team. Assistance includes facilitation, guidance, and support in data analysis and in writing school level improvement plans, a peer review of those plans, and curriculum support for reading and mathematics. DOE staff also provide direct assistance as requested by schools and districts.

School Improvement funding for Title I schools is allocated on a formula basis to all Title I schools in improvement status. The source of this funding is the required set aside of Title I Part A funds.

**Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring**

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Areas in which school missed AYP						School Improvement Status for 2004-2005
		Reading / Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Attendance Rate (elementary / middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Bennett County 03-1, 4606240	Martin Elem, 00045					X		Level 1
Bennett County 03-1, 4606240	Bennett County Jr Hi, 01015							Made AYP 2003-2004
Bon Homme 04-2, 4607400	Bon Homme Middle School, 00987	X						Level 1
Deubrook 05-6, 4678300	Toronto Elementary, 00559	X						Level 1
Chamberlain 07-1, 4612000	Chamberlain Middle School, 00889	X		X				Level 1
Belle Fourche 09-1, 4605610	Belle Fourche Middle Sch, 01117	X		X				Level 1
Andes Central 11-1, 4639540	Andes Central Elementary, 00359	X		X		X		Level 2
Wagner 11-4, 4675420	Wagner Junior High School, 00942							Made AYP 2003-2004
Vermillion 13-1, 4674370	Vermillion Middle School, 00690	X		X				Level 1
Vermillion 13-1, 4674370	Jolley Elementary School, 00301	X		X				Level 1
Florence 14-1, 4624540	Florence Elementary School, 00208	X						Level 1
Watertown 14-4, 4676620	Watertown High School, 00717	X	X	X		X		Level 1

Watertown 14-4, 4676620	Watertown Middle School, 00718	X						Level 1
McLaughlin 15-2, 4646380	McLaughlin Elementary, 00415	X				X		Level 2
McLaughlin 15-2, 4646380	McLaughlin Middle School, 00922	X				X		Level 1
Smee 15-3, 4675600	Wakpala High School, 00699			X				Level 2
Smee 15-3, 4675600	Wakpala Elementary, 00698	X				X		Level 2
Smee 15-3, 4675600	Wakpala Jr. High, 01056	X		X		X		Level 1
Eagle Butte 20-1, 4620100	Eagle Butte Upper Elem, 00605	X		X		X		Level 2
Huron 02-2, 4635480	Huron Colony Elementary, 00312	X						Level 1
Milbank 25-4, 4600002	Koch Elementary School, 00423	X						Level 1
Bonesteel-Fairfax 26-5, 4607670	Bonesteel-Fairfax Jr High, 00881					X		Level 1
Pierre 32-2, 4655260	Jefferson Elementary, 00495	X						Level 1
Freeman 33-1, 4625500	Wolf Creek Colony Elem, 00222							Made AYP 2003-2004
Tripp-Delmont 33-5, 4672450	Clearfield Colony Elementary, 01091							Made AYP 2003-2004
Bon Homme 04-2, 4607400	Hutterische Colony Elem, 00060							Made AYP 2003-2004
Canton 41-1, 4610560	E.O. Lawrence Elementary, 00108	X						Level 1
Meade 46-1, 4669930	Sturgis Williams MS, 00653	X		X				Level 1
White River 47-1, 4678570	White River Elementary, 00753	X						Level 1

White River 47-1, 4678570	White River Middle Sch, 00951	X				X		Level 1
White River 47-1, 4678570	Norris Elementary, 00749	X		X				Level 1
Sioux Falls 49-5, 4666270	Jane Addams Elem, 00594	X		X				Level 2
Flandreau 50-3, 4624390	Flandreau Middle Sch, 00205	X						Level 1
Douglas 51-1, 4619410	Vandenberg Elem, 00436	X						Level 1
Rapid City 51-4, 4659820	General Beadle Elem, 00536	X						Level 4
Rapid City 51-4, 4659820	E. B. Bergquist Elem, 00537					X		Level 3
Rapid City 51-4, 4659820	Horace Mann Elem, 00550	X		X				Level 1
Rapid City 51-4, 4659820	Knollwood Heights Elem, 00539							Made AYP 2003-2004
Doland 56-2, 4619170	Clark Colony Elem, 01101	X						Level 1
Winner 59-2, 4679710	Winner Middle School, 00782	X						Level 1
Shannon County 65-1, 4665460	Batesland Elementary, 00573	X		X		X		Level 2
Shannon County 65-1, 4665460	Wolf Creek Elementary, 00574	X		X				Level 2
Shannon County 65-1, 4665460	Rockyford Elementary, 00576	X		X				Level 2
Todd County 66-1, 4672090	Todd County High, 00678		X	X	X		X	Level 2
Todd County 66-1, 4672090	Rosebud Elem, 00675							Made AYP 2003-2004
Todd County 66-1, 4672090	He Dog Elem, 00669	X		X				Level 2

Todd County 66-1, 4672090	Spring Creek Elem, 00677	X		X				Level 1
Platte 11-3, 4655800	Cedar Grove Colony Elem, 00511	X						Level 1
Sioux Falls 49-5, 4666270	Laura B Anderson Elem, 00597	X		X				Level 2
Sioux Falls 49-5, 4666270	Longfellow Elem, 00601	X						Level 1
Sioux Falls 49-5, 4666270	Lowell Elem, 00602	X		X				Level 1
Sioux Falls 49-5, 4666270	Hawthorne Elem, 00936	X			X			Level 3
Rapid City 51-4, 4659820	Rapid Valley Elem, 00823	X						Level 1
Rapid City 51-4, 4659820	Robbinsdale Elem, 00541	X		X				Level 1
Rapid City 51-4, 4659820	North Middle Sch, 00532	X		X		X		Level 2
Todd County 66-1, 4672090	Todd County Middle Sch, 00814	X	X	X				Level 4
Todd County 66-1, 4672090	North Elem, 00871	X						Level 1
Todd County 66-1, 4672090	O'Kreek Elem, 00509	X		X				Level 2
Todd County 66-1, 4672090	South Elem, 01041	X						Level 2

**D. Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.**

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action).

2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

A meeting was held in October for the five districts in improvement status. Requirements of such designation were outlined and questions answered. School Support Team members and ESA personnel facilitated data analysis retreats and assisted districts with writing their district level improvement plans. Title I staff facilitated a peer review of the district improvement plans in early January.

The DOE is developing a technical assistance with each district identified for improvement status if requested by the district. The technical assistance plans are expected to be implemented by summer 2005.

**Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action**

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Sioux Falls 49-5, 4666270			X	X	NA	NA	Level 1
Rapid City 51-4, 4659820			X	X	NA	NA	Level 1
Eagle Butte 20-2, 4620100	X		X	X	NA	NA	Level 1
Todd County 66-1, 4672090			X	X	NA	NA	Level 1
Shannon County 65-1, 4665460	X		X		NA	NA	Level 1



## **E. PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

### **1. Public School Choice**

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year.

\_\_\_4\_\_\_

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_4\_\_\_ How many of these schools were charter schools?

\_\_\_0\_\_\_

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_4\_\_\_

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_6907\_\_\_

### **2. Supplemental Educational Services**

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_5\_\_\_

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_47\_\_\_

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_2035\_\_\_

## **V. TEACHER and PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY**

**A. Highly Qualified Teachers.** NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

1. In the following table, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” and “low-poverty” schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and “low-poverty” schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
All Schools in State	14,947	13,856	93%
<b>By Poverty Status</b>			
High-Poverty Schools	2,480	2,214	89%
Low-Poverty Schools	4,346	4,039	93%
<b>By Level</b>			
Elementary	7,837	7,365	94%
Secondary	7,090	6,471	91%

2. Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty schools used in the table above.

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>
State Poverty Quartile Breaks	<b>More than .5062 %</b>	<b>Less than .212 %</b>
Poverty Metric Used	rank ordered schools by free and reduced lunch counts	

3. Please provide the State’s definition of elementary and secondary school level as used in the chart above.

a. Elementary Level – This includes: K-8 and Middle School/Junior High (5-8)

b. Secondary Level – This includes 9-12, K-12 Special Education, 7-12 Alternative Schools, and the Auxiliary Placement Programs (K-12)

**B. High-Quality Professional Development.** In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2003-2004 School Year	<b>We did not collect this data</b>

**C. Paraprofessional Quality.** NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate’s (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2003-2004 School Year	<b>59%</b>

## **VI. English Language Proficiency**

### **A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

**Please provide an updated description of the State's progress since September 1, 2003, in developing and implementing ELP standards as required under section 3113(b)(2). Please describe the progress the State has made in linking the ELP standards to academic content in reading/language arts and mathematics. Provide a description of the State's progress in developing ELP standards that are linked to academic content in science. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:**

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**

### **STATE RESPONSE**

South Dakota established a statewide workgroup of educators, all of whom work in the field of English Language Acquisition, to assist the State in developing ELP standards that were linked to the Reading, Language Arts, and Math Content Standards. The statewide workgroup was made up of teachers who work in elementary, middle, and high schools. Included in the group were a school district administrator and a university administrator, both of whom are responsible for the development and delivery of English Language Acquisition classes to elementary, secondary, and/or post-secondary students. The English language learner (ELL) population in the state encompasses Hutterite colony students (these students come to school speaking only a German form of language called Hutterish), Native American students, and refugee and immigrant students. All of these groups were represented in the development of the ELP standards.

Federal guidelines require that states have standards specifically developed for ELLs that define progressive levels of competence in the acquisition of English in four domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The English Language Proficiency Standards must be linked to the content area standards in English language arts, reading, math, and eventually science.

To begin creating these proficiency standards, a committee of ESL educators worked in groups to draft descriptors for content language arts, reading, and math adopted by the State of South Dakota. The draft works was compiled into a single document. Following revisions, a subcommittee of educators worked to link these descriptors with the grade-level expectations. Linking to science standards will be done at a future date using a similar process.

The group completed the ELP standards in April 2004. Informal (social) and formal (school) standards have been developed in the domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. The ELP standards are inclusive of kindergarten through twelfth grade. The

English Language Proficiency standards are presented in the following grade spans: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. These grade spans reflect the United States Department of Education groupings for the No Child Left Behind Act. They are designed to guide ELL teachers in their instruction of ELLs and to provide a bridge to South Dakota's Communication Arts and Math content area standards with science to be added after the revision of the science content standards.

SD Board of Education approval process for the SD English Language Proficiency standards began with the first reading of the ELP standards at the May 17, 2004 state board meeting. The public comment period took place in June of 2004. In July of 2004 the ELP standards were up for public hearing and were approved by the State Board. In August of 2004 school districts were sent letters alerting them to the adoption of the new ELP standards and advising them as to how they can access them. In September of 2004, trainings were held across the state to alert teachers and administrators to the availability of the ELP standards, what they are and how they can utilize them in their classrooms.

## **B. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments**

### **1. Please describe how the State ensures:**

- The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades K-12;
- The ELP assessment(s) address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension

### **2. If the State is using multiple ELP assessments, please describe how the State:**

- Set technical criteria for the assessments (validity and reliability);
- Ensured the assessments are equivalent to one another in their content, difficulty, and quality;
- Reviewed and approved each assessment; and
- Ensured that data from all assessments can be aggregated for comparison and reporting purposes as well as disaggregated by ELP levels and grade levels

### **3. Please provide an updated description, including a timeline, of the State's progress in developing and implementing new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency standards as required by section 3113(b)(2)(C)(iii).**

## **STATE RESPONSE**

1. A letter is sent to superintendents, principals and Title III coordinators before the start of each school year. This letter explains the annual assessment requirements in detail. Part of the items addressed in the letter includes:

Testing Requirements For Students Identified As  
Limited English Proficient Students

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 contains some sweeping changes for education. Some of those changes will impact how we identify and assess limited English proficient students attending South Dakota's schools. The new requirements are contained in Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students and in Title I: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged.

One requirement that must be met by **all districts** identifying and reporting students identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) is the requirement for administration of an English language proficiency test and for annual progress reporting for students identified as LEP.

Once determination of LEP status is accomplished, the student will be **annually** assessed using the **Stanford English Language Proficiency Test (SELP)** produced by Harcourt. The SELP will annually measure the English language proficiency of all identified LEP students, documenting their progress in acquiring English language proficiency. The SELP will be administered in February of every school year.

The State reports data using an ELP composite score on the SELP which does address the five domains in the following manner:

The composite score is the sum total of all of the five sub-tests. Each sub-test has its own score to form the composite score. The oral language is assessed with the listening and speaking sub-tests. The writing is assessed with two components, they are written conventions and product writing. Reading has its own score. To derive comprehension scores the sub-test of listening and reading are added together. The test developer, Harcourt Educational Measurement, used natural weighting resulting in similar scores across all domains. For example, reading at lower levels is 48 points while listening and speaking is 54 points. A final analysis of the sub-tests shows they are close to being the same weight.

2. NA



3. Below is a timeline for developing the enhanced ELP assessment (augmented SELP) that is aligned to the new ELP standards.

Date	Action Steps
<b>2004-05</b>  January - June 2004  Jul-04 Jan/Feb 2005  Jan-Apr 2005  Feb. 2005  June 05	<b>5 Domains + R&amp;M (SELP)</b>  Develop standards and performance descriptors  Board Approval  Alignment Study: standards / test  Item Development  Administer test  Bias Content Review
<b>2005-06</b>  Sept. 05  Nov 05  Feb. 2006  Apr-06	<b>5 Domains + R&amp;M (Augmented SELP)</b>  Field Test  Alignment Study  Administer Augmented test  Standards Setting/ cut scores

### **C. English Language Proficiency Assessment Data**

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2003-2004** school year test administration. English language proficiency data should include **all** students in the State who were assessed and identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments. The State must also disaggregate ELP data by number and percentage of students who participated in Title III programs.

The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level and should include the following:

1. Total number and percentage of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments)
2. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments)
3. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s)
4. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year
5. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III
6. Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2003-2004 school year.

\  
States may use the sample formats below or another format to report the requested information.

**Table C-1: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 1, 2, and 3 on the previous page**

2003-2004 Data for All LEP Students in the State																
Name of LEP Assessment  (1)	Total number and percentage of ALL Students Assessed  (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL Students Identified as LEP  (3)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency													
			Number & Percentage at Pre Emergent or Level 1  (4)	Number and Percentage at Emergent or Level 2  (5)	Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 3  (6)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 4  (7)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5  (8)	Number and Percentage NOT Testedd  (9)								
IPT/LAS																
SELP			6120	277	6.8%	20	0.5%	500	12.3%	1839	45.4%	1416	34.9%	2068	33.8%	

5% total pop LEP

**Table C-2: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 4, 5, and 6 on the previous page**

2003-2004 Datat for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III															
Name of LEP Assessment	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs	Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 yr monitoring	Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency												
			Number & Percentage at Pre Emergent or Level 1		Number and Percentage at Emergent or Level 2		Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 3		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 4		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5		Number and Percentage NOT Tested		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		(5)		(6)		(7)		(8)		(9)		
SELP			207	7.3%	14	0.5%	352	12.4%	1329	46.6%	948	33.3%	1383	32.7%	

## D. Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111(c).

1. Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2003-2004 1020 Statewide
2. Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2003-2004 959 Title III  
1020 Statewide
3. Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2003-2004 0

## E. Definition of Proficient

**If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:**

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments
- A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English
- Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English

### STATE RESPONSE

South Dakota administered the SELP in February of 2004. At this writing, no changes have been made, however there will be changes over the next two years. The test score range and cut scores are as follow:

<b>Table 2: Total Test</b>						
	<b>Performance Levels</b>					
<b>Grade</b>	Emergent	Basic	Intermediate	Proficient		Max
<b>K</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>82</b>		<b>102</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>84</b>		<b>102</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>87</b>		<b>102</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>82</b>		<b>102</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>84</b>		<b>102</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>87</b>		<b>102</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>88</b>		<b>110</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>91</b>		<b>110</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>94</b>		<b>110</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>88</b>		<b>110</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>90</b>		<b>110</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>110</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>94</b>		<b>110</b>

Cut scores on the English language proficiency test are set and reported based on the performance descriptors, to reflect student progress. The curriculum of the English language learning program is aligned with these performance descriptors. By aligning the curriculum goals and objectives of the program to the performance descriptors, teachers are able to track the progress of students through the program and determine their readiness to achieve the content standards intended to be met by all South Dakota students.

The performance descriptors are organized into proficiency levels. These proficiency levels describe how an ELL student performs in English and reflect increasing acquisition of English language skills.

The test developer, Harcourt Educational Measurement, determined the cut score based on the state's definition for each level of proficiency. Proficiency is defined as attaining Level 5 on the Stanford ELP.

The composite score is the sum total of all of the five sub-tests. Each sub-test has its own score to form the composite score. The oral language is assessed with the listening and speaking sub-tests. The writing is assessed with two components, they are written conventions and product writing. Reading has its own score. To derive comprehension scores the sub-test of listening and reading are added together.

The test developer, Harcourt Educational Measurement, used natural weighting resulting in similar scores across all domains. For example, reading at lower levels is 48 points while listening and speaking is 54 points. A final analysis of the sub-tests shows they are close to being the same weight.

## F. Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English in Title III served schools as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:

- A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments
- A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)
- A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next

### STATE RESPONSE

At this time no changes have been made, however the State will be making changes with an amendment this spring.

The English language proficiency levels are as follows:

- **Proficient:** An ELL student performing at the proficient level reads, writes, speaks and listens in English with language proficiency adequate to meet expectations for the student's grade level.
- **Intermediate:** An ELL student performing at the intermediate level reads, writes, speaks and listens in English with language proficiency adequate to meet some expectations for the student's grade level, but is not yet fluent enough to sufficiently to meet grade-level expectations.
- **Basic:** An ELL student performing at the basic level is starting to read, write, speak and listen in English, but is not fluent enough to function in English without assistance.
- **Emergent:** An ELL student performing at the emergent level has very little ability to read, write, speak, and listen to English. The student has a few isolated words.
- **Pre-emergent:** An ELL student performing at the pre-emergent level does not understand enough language to read, write, speak, or listen in English.

Making progress is advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by Stanford ELP composite score each school year (see table 2).

Harcourt describes the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next in their discussion of Performance levels in their technical reports which states:

Grouping test results by performance level corresponds to a level of mastery as judged by teachers and provides information about what students should know and be able to do in a particular subject area and at a particular grade level. The

range of scores corresponding to each performance level is determined by a procedure that results in the identification of cut scores. A modified-Angoff procedure (Angoff, 1984) was used to produce the recommended cut scores for the Stanford ELP. The modified-Angoff procedure has a long and successful history in similar applications for both educational and professional certification assessments. The use of the procedure by Harcourt provided a systematic technique for eliciting judgments from panels of experts (i.e., standard setting committees), produced consensus among these experts, and quantified the results of the judgments. The modified-Angoff procedure is widely recognized as the simplest method to use (Norcini, et al., 1987; Shepard, 1980). Moreover, research has shown that the modified-Angoff method produces ratings with better reliability and smaller variability among the ratings of judges than other standard setting procedures (Andrew and Hecht, 1976; Brennan and Lockwood, 1980; Cross, et al., 1984; Poggio, Glasnapp, and Eros, 1981; Skakun and Kling, 1980). This procedure represents an appropriate balance between statistical rigor and informed opinion.

## G. Definition of Cohort

**If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.**

### STATE RESPONSE

At this time no changes have been made, however the State will be making changes with an amendment this spring.

The definition of cohort 1 is those students identified and assessed statewide as LEP in grades K-12 in the school year 2002-2003. Additional cohorts for ensuing years will include new or re-enrolling K-12 students statewide who were not included in Cohort 1.

*Cohort 2 will include new or re-enrolling K-12 students statewide who were not included in Cohort 1. Cohort 2 and subsequent cohorts may be dominated by kindergarten students at the pre-emergent and emergent levels along with new enrollees in the state's schools. The baseline for Cohort 2 will be determined in the spring of 2004 based on the data from the Stanford ELP.*

South Dakota decided to include all LEP students in a single cohort since there were relatively few LEP students across all grades. In 2003, approximately 3,361 students were identified as LEP and then tested for proficiency using the Stanford ELP. If cohorts were based on grade spans or proficiency levels, the numbers of students in

some of the levels would be too small for reliability over time. Anecdotal evidence indicates that subsequent assessments will result in more students identified as LEP.

#### **H. Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.**

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State?

☐ Yes ☒ No, but we are in the process of making this information available for the future.

#### **I. Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants**

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III

**\*Unit of Analysis/Cohort:** Grades K - 12

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual	
2003-2004 School Year Cohort 1 – Grades K-12	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
	75	965	44	562	20	257	24	302

#### **J. Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2003-2004 School Year**



1. Number of Title III subgrants \_\_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_\_
2. Number of Title III subgrants that met Title III  
annual measurable achievement objectives \_\_\_\_\_0\_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet  
Title III annual measurable achievement objectives \_\_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet  
Title III annual measurable achievement objectives  
Due to large increases in the number of LEP  
Immigrant students \_\_\_\_\_0\_\_\_\_\_

### **VII. Persistently Dangerous Schools**

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2004-2005 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>

	<b>Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>
2004-2005 School Year	<b>2</b>

## **VIII. Graduation and Dropout Rates**

### **A. Graduation Rates**

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2002-2003 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

**GRADUATION RATE**

<b>High School Graduates</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	95.95%
American Indian or Alaska Native	83.98%
Asian	91.40%
Black or African American	91.49%
Hispanic or Latino	89.02%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	96.80%
Students with Disabilities	99.04%
Limited English Proficient	100%
Economically Disadvantaged	93.24%
Migrant	100%
Male	95.54%
Female	96.37%

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

## B. Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2002-2003 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

**DROPOUT RATE**

<b>Dropouts</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	2.29%
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.91%
Asian	1.33%
Black or African American	1.95%
Hispanic or Latino	2.39%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	
White	1.48%
Students with Disabilities	2.65%
Limited English Proficient	0.54%
Economically Disadvantaged	4.47%
Migrant	0.71%
Male	2.44%
Female	2.13%

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.